

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231*NPd*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/956,696	12/08/97	JEJELOWO	M 97U001

JAIMES SHER  
UNIVATION TECHNOLOGIES LILC  
5555 SAN FELIPE  
SUITE 1950  
HOUSTON TX 77056-2723

IM62/0109

EXAMINER	
RABAGO, R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1713	<i>21</i>

DATE MAILED: 01/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Interview Summary**

Application No. <b>08/986,696</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Jejelowo et al.</b>
Examiner <b>R. Rabago</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1713</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ex. R. Rabago(3) Mr. M. Kurtzman(2) Mr. J. Sher

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 4, 2001Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

Harrington, Doyle (of record)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' representative asserted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made because: a) applicants have found that the claimed process results in unexpected improvements, and b) the references provide no motivation for selecting the claimed metallocene. For the comparative examples shown in the specification, the examiner was in agreement regarding unexpected properties. However, it was maintained that given the scopes of the both the claims (rather broad) and the comparative examples (quite narrow), the showing was not deemed to be commensurate with what is shown in the examples of the reference (which shows copolymerization of ethylene and cyclic olefins using a mono-Cp hafnocene substituted with t-butyl). Applicants indicated that they will consider amending either the metallocene structure or the process conditions of the independent claims to further distinguish from the disclosure of the reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.



DAVID W. WU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.